Remarks

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-48 were pending in the application and stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 2, 10, 21, 30, 31, 39, 47 and 48 have been amended, claim 46 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 49-59 have been added. Thus, claims 1-45 and 47-59 remain pending for consideration. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentably distinct from the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 10 and 39, Applicant has amended claims 10 and 39 to provide antecedent basis for the term "the buffer." Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in FIG. 2a (buffers 215) and paragraphs [0042] and [0047].

Regarding claims 1, 20 and 30, page 2 of the Office Action asserts a lack of antecedent basis for the terms "the frequency domain" and "the time domain." However, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because those skilled in the art would recognize that mathematical functions or signals may be represented in the time domain or the frequency domain. Further, those skilled in the art would recognize that a fast Fourier transform (FFT) converts from the time domain to the frequency domain.

See, M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(e) (stating that if "the scope of a claim would be reasonably ascertainable by those skilled in the art, then the claim is not indefinite").

One skilled in the art would recognize that "the time domain" is a term commonly used to describe the analysis of mathematical functions or signals with respect to time (e.g., data values may be known at various points in time). Further, those skilled in the art would recognize that "the frequency domain" is a term commonly used to describe the analysis of mathematical functions or signals with respect to frequency (e.g., data values may be known at various frequencies).

Further, stating that FFT is used to convert time-based samples to frequency coefficients provides antecedent basis for "the time domain" and "the frequency domain." See, M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(e) (stating that "[i]nherent components of elements recited have antecedent basis in the recitation of the components themselves"). Independent claims 1, 20 and 30 use FFT to convert time-based data (e.g., time-based digital samples or time-based multimedia samples) to frequency-based data (e.g., frequency coefficients). Because those skilled in the art would recognize that FFT converts from the time domain to the frequency domain (and that IFFT converts from the frequency domain to the time domain), additional antecedent basis is not required. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-9, 11-19, 21-29, 31-38 and 40-48. Pursuant to the Office Action, Applicant has amended independent claim 30 to include the allowable subject matter indicated in claim 46. Further, in new claim 49, Applicant has rewritten claim 5 into independent

form to include all of the limitations of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 30 and 49 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 16, 20, 23-25, 30, 32-33, 43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,990,140 issued to Loomis et al. ("Loomis"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Loomis fails to identically teach every element of the claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim).

In particular, Loomis does not transform a plurality of time-based samples from a plurality of concurrent multimedia signal carriers into a plurality of frequency coefficients. An aspect of independent claims 1 and 20 is that data from a plurality of concurrent carriers can be processed at the same time. This allows, for example, concurrent signals from several different transponders or carriers to be stored on a mass storage device so a user can later watch any of several programs that are broadcast at the same time. See paragraph [0009] of the present application.

By way of contrast with the present claims, Loomis teaches a process for increasing the strength of a GPS signal by enabling "a continuous integration without the nullifying effect of inversions of the data bits." Col. 2, lines 27-30 and lines 59-60. However, Loomis provides no teaching of processing multiple satellite GPS signals at the same time. Rather, Loomis explicitly teaches that signals from different satellites are **sequentially processed**. See col. 4, lines 37-42 ("the present invention is used for

acquiring the GPS signal for a first GPS satellite... **Then**, the method of the present invention...may be used for acquiring the GPS signal from other GPS satellites") (emphasis added).

Thus, Loomis does not teach or suggest an FFT module "to transform a plurality of time-based digital samples *from each of said concurrent signal carriers* into a plurality of frequency coefficients," as recited, among other things, in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added). Further, Loomis does not teach or suggest a method for concurrently convolving multimedia data from multiple signal carriers by performing FFT "on time-based multimedia data from a *first group of signal carriers* to generate a set of frequency coefficients representing said first group of signal carriers in the frequency domain," as recited, among other things, in claim 20. (Emphasis added). Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 20 be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 4 and 24, page 3 of the Office Action asserts that "a use of a plurality of cable carriers is inherent in the GPS receiver." Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests that the Examiner provide an explanation of how a GPS receiver (which receives a GPS signal from a satellite) uses multimedia signal carriers received from cable networks.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Loomis fails to disclose each of the limitations in any of the pending independent claims. For at least the same reasons, each of the claims depending therefrom are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Further,

subject matter indicated to be allowable has been included in amended claim 30 and new claim 49.

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims represent patentable subject matter. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By /Kory D. Christensen/
    Kory D. Christensen
    Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999